DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 590 EA 012 396

AUTHOR Armstrong, Robert L.
TITLE Preparing a School for Evaluation. Educational Services Bulletin 54.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Committees; Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Evaluation; Program Development; Self Evaluation; Senior High Schools
IDENTIFIERS North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

Beginning with preevaluation and ending with postevaluation procedures, this publication addresses the entire process of evaluation of a secondary school by an accrediting association such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It attempts to provide insights into conducting preliminary steps, doing a self-evaluation, preparing for a visiting accrediting team, and implementing and responding to the team report. The logistical considerations covered include choice of steering committee, choice of evaluation format, allocation of faculty time, cost estimation of the evaluation process, and needs of the visiting team. A short selected bibliography is included. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181590

PREPARING A SCHOOL FOR EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By
ROBERT L. ARMSTRONG
Department of Secondary Education
Arizona State University

Educational Services Bulletin 54

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Carey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by
College of Education
Bureau of Educational Research and Services
Merwin Deever, Director
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
May, 1977

2

EA 012 396

Foreword

This publication addresses the entire process of a school's self-evaluation. Insights are provided into the preliminary steps, the actual self-evaluation process, preparing for the visiting accrediting team, departure of the visiting team, and team report. The logistical considerations include choice of steering committee, choice of evaluation format, allocation of faculty time, cost estimation of the evaluation process and needs of the visiting team. A selected bibliography is included.

Educators will find this report of value since the topic is timely, and the suggestions insightful.

MD

Preparing a School for Evaluation

ROBERT L. ARMSTRONG

There can be little argument that "Preparing a School for Evaluation" covers a great deal of ground. In the first place, "evaluation" has been interpreted to mean the evaluation by the visiting team. Therefore, part of what is called "the preparation" would be the entire sequence of events involved in the self-evaluation process; all the preliminary steps of organization, motivation, and then the self-evaluation act. That portion includes most of what would seem to be implied by the title. However, this paper goes a bit further and treats briefly the aftermath and the follow-up process as well.

Preliminary Steps

One aspect in the sequence of events of self-evaluation is "motivation." This point is very important. No teacher would deny the utter necessity of motivation in a viable learning process, and the self-evaluation of a school is no exception. The people involved, the faculty members, students and parents, need to fully face the questions of "why?" There are really two "whys" here. The first of these is, "Why should our school belong to an accrediting association at all?" The other question is, "If it's good to belong to an accrediting association why is a major effort like a self-evaluation, in particular a self-evaluation every seven years, a viable condition of membership?"

These are serious questions, and they are being seriously, even belligerently, asked by faculty members, the leading principals in the evaluation process. The answer may best come from someone outside the school, if he has a candid and believable style.

Of what should an answer consist? There are a variety of things to consider but it appears that one of the most important is the aspect of professional self-policing, that is, professional peer review. The reason this is an important point is that with varying degrees of intensity, educators have been plagued by some of their colleagues of other professions about their lack of "professionalism." What other professionals mean by this charge has not always been clear. However, one particular charge keeps surfacing, and that is that in education there is no internal self-policing mechanism that in some way insures the competence and ethical standards of the members of the profession.

This charge is true to some extent when it applies to the individual members of the profession, but it is not true when it applies to the profession on an institutional basis. At the institutional level there are accrediting associations that concern themselves with both minimum standards and the increase in quality of program and performance. Further, these associations are voluntary and governed by the

members in a reasonable facsimile of a democratic process. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is the oldest and, in many ways, the strongest of these associations; and by the standards of other professions, it is very professional.

Most new teachers, and a dismaying number of continuing teachers, do not know about accreditation. It is likely that a very large number of teachers, parents, and students are not well-versed about North Central Association. In this day of threatening words such as "evaluation" and "accountability," they are unaware that on the institutional level, North Central has been evaluating schools for a very long time, and quite effectively.

When a school starts preparing for an evaluation, the people that are involved need to know why such an association is needed. They need to know the conditions of membership in the association. They need to know that the association maintains a comprehensive set of stringent minimum standards, and that their principal has to attest to the maintenance of these standards on an annual basis. They need to know that evaluation by a visiting team is not an "inspection" or a "qualifications review" but a validation and improvement study by professional peers whose only goal is to help the school improve its program and whose only remuneration is the satisfaction of helping their fellow educators. If they know and fully understand these factors, this knowledge will likely make a considerable difference in the quality of the self-evaluation.

At this point it would be wise to review the implication of the word "remuneration." It was noted that the only remuneration for the members of the visiting committee is the satisfaction of helping fellow educators. This aspect of a voluntary, cooperative endeavor, is worthy of explanation. Some of the critics of professional organizations are prone to cite cost as a major reason why these organizations are detrimental to the functioning of a school. They say that the school would be better advised to put the money into capital outlay for equipment and facilites.

Critics such as these are ignoring two important facts. The first is that of actual expense. Costs are not nearly as great as some people believe. The other fact is much more important but, unfortunately, much less tangible. That is the fact of the genuine improvement in the school and its program that may result from a good self-evaluation. The critics do not readily admit this. They tend to view the hours spent in reviewing program and facilities as wasted time that could be put to better use. There is evidence that it is not true. Many benefits result from a good self-evaluation.

What are some of these benefits? They are not always obvious. Sometimes an evaluation results in the board spending money for things which should have been purchased years ago. Sometimes it results in new policy, in new program direction, and in new techniques. There are other benefits, however, that are even less tangible.

The writer conducted a two-year study on 17 high schools in Arizona that were undergoing the evaluation process. Each faculty was randomly divided into thirds and an assessment was conducted on the first third at the completion of the self-evaluation and before the arrival of the visiting team. A similar assessment, with some appropriate adjustments, was conducted on the second one-third after the visiting team had departed. The final assessment, on the last one-third, was conducted after the team report had been returned and studied. An open-ended question at the end of the study asked faculty to comment on the most positive experience that they had had in the entire process. There were many responses from the nearly 800 faculty members, but a very popular cluster concerned three things: 1) increased respect for their colleagues, 2) increased intra-faculty communication and 3) learning things about the school and school program that they did not know. These kinds of outcomes may be difficult to measure, but they are important. The single most positive experience was the experience of the visiting team. That is particularly remarkable when it is recalled that only two-thirds of the respondents had experienced the visiting team before they were assessed. The concrete evaluation benefits of a pleasant visiting team experience may seem somewhat remote, but it would be difficult to deny that when fellow professionals have a chance for discussion under reasonably receptive conditions some valuable idea exchanging is inevitable.

Thus far, we have considered the "professionalism" aspect of peer review and self-policing, and some of the benefits of the evaluation process. But benefits of association membership also accrue to the teachers themselves. There are many, and they are usually found in the Policies and Standards bulletin which is modified and published annually. They consist of such things as the preparation period for every teacher, the limit on student-to-professional staff ratio, the limit on the number of students a teacher can be required to teach per day, the various requirements for the library, the basic qualifications that a teacher must possess to teach a given subject, etc. Sometimes young teachers do not view the latter as a protection, but more seasoned readers can doubtlessly recall a time or place when a new teacher with the minimum two semesters of college English was asked to teach English because that was where he or she was needed. Teachers often taught in areas where they had inadequate preparation.

In regard to the other benefits mentioned, some elaboration is helpful when talking to a faculty. Most young teachers today, especially those who have been raised and educated in urban areas or prosperous small towns, have no conception of how nearly unbearable a teacher's lot might be without the protection of an accrediting association, particularly in a period such as this when there are more aspiring teachers than there are jobs. Young teachers of the past have taught eight clock hours without a free period, without the support of a library, and with only one set of text books. Similar things could not

occur in a school accredited by the North Central Association.

There are other somewhat less tangible benefits. The fact that the board-to-faculty relationship is sufficiently defined to keep board members from acting like supervisors is worth mentioning. Other benefits include the supportive community-to-school relationship that is required. It is good to have a portfolio of facts and examples that can be used to help teachers realize that North Central membership is a worthwhile condition, and that self-evaluation has some things to recommend it as a viable condition of membership.

The Self-Evaluation Process

There are few areas of education that have received more research and development efforts than that of evaluation. Evaluation of teachers, evaluation of students, and evaluation of schools and programs all have been the target of considerable planning, testing and experimenting. In some states, laws on regular teacher certification have sent educators back to the drawing board on teacher evaluation, and most schools are working very diligently to develop more realistic ways of reviewing teaching competency.

This is an aside, however. The concern, here, is institutional self-evaluation. There has been a lot of studying done and a lot of ideas generated on how better to evaluate a school. In the area of reporting forms, which is a somewhat more obvious manifestation of the movement, there are several examples: the regular Evaluative Criteria, 4th edition; the experimental version of the Evaluative Criteria, which is quite similar to the current junior high/middle school form; and the NCA Evaluation Guide. All of these new ideas have helped in some ways. The report form will make some difference; also, some new techniques may improve the result. These techniques include such things as clever choice of sub-committee composition, some in-group styles for improving committee work, and some in-service practice in interaction skills.

There are still four ingredients that probably do most to assure a valid self-evaluation. These are candor, thoroughness, comprehensiveness of the data base, and public review of the reports. It is important to note that none of these ingredients is easily achieved and, when consulting with a school in their self-evaluation, the only one of the four that the school can be compelled to do is have the public review. An acceptance of the worth of the other ingredients must always be nurtured.

Terms such as "candor" and "honesty" can be somewhat elusive. In self-evaluation "candor" is simply reporting things the way they are, at least insofar as professional judgments are valid. Unfortunately, this is not easy. The people involved in self-evaluation are looking at themselves. They are looking at the programs they devised, the curriculum they developed. If human ego is not the prime mover of human affairs, it is at least very close to the top; and it is very difficult for people to look

at their own efforts candidly. To make matters worse, certain portions of school programs are often lacking for want of things that only other people (board, superintendent, etc.) can provide. In most school self-evaluations there is a strong tendency to want to gloss over certain points or omit certain conditions simply because the teachers involved are lacking some facilities, supplies or time that they need and are not given.

Human nature seems to predicate strongly that we rationalize or ignore our failings, and the attitude just naturally carries over into the self-evaluation. Once this point has been made to a sub-committee the members generally accept it willingly and proceed to do a much more honest job of looking at themselves.

Another aspect of candor is the predisposition of most of us to look at our own efforts through rose-colored glasses. Once the foundation has been laid for candor, this problem seems to shrink. The only real problem is the initial fear of being looked down upon by someone else. If the school employs a consultant, it is good for him to play the role of devil's advocate. When people find that he can query and question without making them feel inadequate, they tend to relax and become more open. It is not that they are lulled into a false sense of security, but once they become willing to bring deficiencies and problems out into the open and talk about them, they find that it is not fatal. Further, once they break this barrier and begin to talk freely about their problems, new ideas and approaches begin to occur to them and the entire interaction becomes exciting.

The next listed point was that of thoroughness. This is very important but less profound than candor, and certainly easier to handle. Again, this involves two main aspects, one connected with the opinion side of the evaluation and one concerned with the factual side. The two are not entirely separable, but a comment on the opinion portion is called for because here is where the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed., may have a flaw. In particular, the problem concerns the lists of checklist and evaluation items that make up the framework of the reports.

The national committees who contributed to making the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed. what it is today did not plan it that way. What they had in mind was asking every conceivable question about every facet of the program so that the self-reviewing committees in the school would be able to leave no stone unturned in assessing their own programs. What more often happens is the reverse, however. School subcommittees are often so dismayed by the sheer volume of questions that their first order of business is to figure out a short cut that will reduce the amount of work. While not necessarily bad, some typical shortcuts hold a solid potential for mediocrity. One is the "let's divide up the work" approach. Under this system, one person takes the first page, one takes the second, and so on until the entire report is subdivided. If after each individual completes his own section, they come together as a committee and seriously review the responses, this ap-

proach might be effective. However, the temptation not to go that second mile would be ever present.

No matter how thoughtful the evaluation sub-committees are, they cannot develop an optimal report without doing the necessary leg work and gathering data. On this point, also, it appears that the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed., leaves something to be desired. There are many questions, and they are worded in such a way that it just seems natural to answer them spontaneously, even if they are discussed thoroughly first. There is a slight condition of "piecemealness" to the questions in the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed. The separate reports are sectioned, and each section treats one aspect of the program. The problem may be that when individual questions are read, it is often difficult to sense the "connectedness" of the questions, and to realize that most of the answers might come from a common data base. The end result is that many self-studies are completed with a minimum of hard data, and often with only the opinions of the sub-committees themselves.

Many schools have been evaluated well by faculties using Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed. However, there are certain characteristics that are indigenous to its structure that may contribute to weaker self-studies. The two newer forms offer no guarantees of a valid self-evaluation. However, other things being equal, it is possible that a poor effort is more likely to embarrass the school if one of the newer forms was used. Also, the newer forms have characteristics of open-endedness, as well as provisions for much broader opinion data gathering, than are encouraged by the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed.

Whichever form is used, how is it possible to get sub-committees to be thorough in the realm of factual information? Somehow they must be convinced that it is important that they marshal evidence of what they are saying. It may be part and parcel with convincing them the job is worth doing at all.

Perhaps one of the more effective means is to select several committees whose task is somewhat more difficult and show their great need for a pervasive data base. One outstanding example is the committee on "Staff and Administration." Those committee members are put into the unenviable position of having to evaluate their administrative superiors, and that is a difficult task under the most benign circumstances. Other sub-committees have also experienced the agony of soul-searching, and wondering how honest they dare be and still continue to work harmoniously in the school. No sub-committee can produce an evaluation report that consists of their own unsubstantiated opinions. Members need to collect data to substantiate the numbers and comments that are going into the report. If the school policy says that the principal is supposed to make three supervisory visitations to each teacher annually, then they need to poll the teachers to find out if he is doing so. If budgets are being submitted without consultation with department chairpersons, then they need to poll these

people to substantiate that fact. Not only is there something very compelling about hard, accurate data, but, in addition, there is something less offensive about it. If a committee is critical of the role-action of an administrator and its criticism is based on unsubstantiated committee opinion, then it appears that the committee members "don't like" the administrator and are taking it out on him. Data gathered from the entire group has an entirely different impact.

The next ingredient of a good self-evaluation is comprehensiveness of the data base. Thoroughness is more of an attitude on the part of the evaluation sub-committees than a set of techniques. But comprehensiveness of the data base deals more with technique, and involves guidelines for making the data base broader, more complete and more realistic.

An example of what is meant might be appropriate. The data report on School and Community is one that is sometimes incomplete. Portions of it are usually factual, for example the tax base portion, simply because these facts are available and because there is no intelligent way to guess at that sort of data. On the other hand, other portions, such as the demographic profile of the community, are sometimes minimally prepared. In some cases that entire section may be a generalized narrative expression of what the committee members think to be true about the community. In such instances the local committee is viewing the self-evaluation as an exercise in producing written documents for the visiting team rather than as an honest attempt to learn more about their school community.

Other such committees that have taken their tasks more seriously have made the perfectly honest error of procuring biased information. One of the more common techniques in this kind of situation is to select a random sample of students and ask them to take home a demographic questionnaire and have their parents complete it. On the surface, this seems to be a valid procedure; however, the parents of teenage children probably do not constitute a representative cross-section of the community at large. Therefore, the data can be quite misleading.

There are many other ways to broaden the data base but they cannot all be treated here. Student, parent and teacher opinion inventories are among the means, and this is where the experimental Evaluative Criteria and the NCA Evaluation Guide have a bit of an edge. They furnish sample questionnaires as an impetus toward evaluation. Other inventories can add a great deal more. Each local sub-committee has to recognize the need and be willing to do the leg work. The members also have to have the courage to ask pointed questions. This often becomes difficult when a committee is investigating district office services. Both courage and discretion are called for, and there are no pat answers. Those in charge (steering committee, consultant, etc.) need to continually encourage, suggest, question and support. A local committee needs to move into an optimal evaluation attitude by

stages and that seems to be part of the learning process.

One other way to broaden the data base is to broaden involvement by using non-certificated personnel, students and parents as a part of the self-evaluation group in addition to faculty. Which students and parents to use, and how many, is not easily determined. At this time, most schools are trying to involve such persons but with varying degrees of success. One problem is that the work of evaluation is often done at times not convenient to community people. As a general rule the students and parents should be what might be called "encouraged volunteers." If the faculty does not take the initiative to reach out, it is not too likely that the outsiders will come forth. At the same time, if the faculty does not find people who are interested and want to be there, it can be guaranteed that they are not going to be of significant value. One school in the recent experience of the writer called for student volunteers to help develop the philosophy. Students formed their own small groups, and worked without the inhibiting influence that they might have felt from teachers. They did well, and made a genuine contribution. It might be added that in organizing the self-evaluation, the selection of the steering committee is critical. Members need to be patient, persistent, self-initiating, tactful, and respectful of their fellows. They have to do unpopular things and make unpopular decisions, and the success of any self-study effort will depend at least in part on the capabilities of the members of this committee.

The final ingredient to be considered is public review of the reports. What is meant is a visual and oral report-back to the principals of the self-evaluation; that is, the faculty, the involved non-certificated personnel and any students or parents. Everyone should have a good grasp of what each report contains, and the opportunity to make their own contribution. Also, the sub-committees need to be aware that what they do will be reviewed. It would be unreasonable to expect the entire group to write every report but, at some point along the way, provision has to be made for every participant to contribute to every report. The public review provides this opportunity.

It is essential that the rough-finish form of each report be duplicated so that every member of the total group may have a copy. Occasionally a school group will resist this step, ostensibly on the basis of economy. However, it is too important to omit. There is a great deal of difference in the subliminal thinking of a committee that intends to complete their report in relative obscurity, and one that knows that the entire group is going to review it. There is an even greater difference if committee members know that everyone else will not only review their work, but will each have his/her own copy.

Preparing for the Visiting Team

Perhaps a word about the final preparation for the visiting team is in order. The self-study is the critical act, and during the earlier part of the self-study process there may be a tendency to underplay the event

of the team visit. There are a number of reasons for this. One is to reduce anxiety and the other is to keep firmly in their minds the fact that the self-evaluation is the truly significant part of the whole effort. However, sometimes the de-emphasis of the team visit is overdone.

At that point it usually pays to re-define the priorities. It must be admitted that the self study is the critical part but that the role of the visiting team is an indispensable link in the total process. It is certainly obvious that the visitors could not possibly evaluate a school program in three days, but it is certainly true that, with complete reports in hand, plus ready access to campus sources of information, they can legitimately act to verify and validate the self-study, as well as make their own suggestions for improvement. At this point, the local people usually come to the realization of why their reports need to be neat, readable and complete. When data are missing or inconsistent, evaluators must spend time trying to track them down, and often end up settling for less than what was needed.

Other than the readiness of the reports themselves, perhaps the most important thing is making sure that every team member has all the reports he or she needs. Every visitor should have a report of each sub-committee on which he or she is acting, as well as the School/Community Report and a copy of the Philosophy. They should have these in hand at least 10 days in advance to enable them to do some homework before their arrival. Optimally, each team member should have a copy of the total school evaluation report. This is not absolutely vital. However, it enables the visiting team member to determine whether some of the observed attributes in one area are common to the other areas.

Logistical Considerations

The major part of this paper has treated the philosophical and strategic considerations in the evaluation process. There are logistical problems that must be treated as well. To the hard pressed principal or steering committee the logistical aspects may often loom as the overriding problems in the self-evaluation process and the preparation for the visiting team.

No absolute guarantees exist but there are some guidelines and points of advisement which should be considered in approaching the administrative problems. In this brief section the writer will treat the following points: 1) choice of steering committee, 2) choice of evaluation format, 3) allocation of faculty time during the evaluation process, 4) cost estimation of the evaluation process, and 5) needs of the visiting teams.

Choice of Steering Committee. This was alluded to in the earlier part of the paper. There are no hard and fast rules. In certain situations it may not even matter whether committee members are selected by the principal or elected by the faculty and staff. However, past experience suggests that certain points are important: 1) the steering committee should probably not consist of the department chairpersons.

Structuring the evaluation effort along the traditional lines of school authority does not seem to be very productive; 2) if an administrator is a member of the steering committee, he/she should probably not be the chief administrator of the school and, in fact, should be a person fully capable of playing a supporting role. It has been found that there is a strong tendency for members of a steering committee to defer to an administrator who is a member of the committee; 3) the members should be respected, self-directed people who are held in high esteem in the informal authority structure of the faculty; and 4) if the professional staff intends to have serious involvement from students and the lay community, then these segments should be strongly represented on the steering committee.

Choice of Evaluation Format. The question here is less that of which is best than that of knowing what is available and being able to choose from among intelligent options. Generally speaking, among published reporting forms there are two types: 1) those that are finely detailed and highly structured, exemplified by the Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed.; and 2) those that are more flexible and comprehensive, calling for an abundance of grounded data, exemplified by the NCA Evaluation Guide. The professional staff of each school should be aware of the fact that it may create its own unique format, subject only to the approval of the State Committee.

Allocation of Faculty Time. One of the most difficult problems of the self-evaluation process is the allocation of time. Some faculties prefer to be given deadlines, and then to be allowed to meet and work on a catch-as-catch-can basis. The primary drawback of this approach is that unless some time is arbitrarily freed, it will be rare for the members of any one committee to meet at one time. The result is often that by deadline time the report sections may not all be adequately prepared and the final complete report is haphazard and uneven.

A more satisfactory method seems to be that of setting aside a block of time on a weekly basis. If a full block of class time is used, some teachers and parents may legitimately object to the lost instruction time. If all evaluation work is done in after school hours many teachers will legitimately object to their loss of planning time. A compromise may be the use of a schedule similar to "the assembly schedule." On such a day all classes are shortened by a small amount of time, such as 10 minutes. Teachers then meet from the end of class time to the time they are ordinarily obligated to stay for student advisement. Such a regular provision of time not only provides time for committees to meet, but enables the steering committee to meet with the self-evaluation committees as groups when needed.

Cost Estimation of the Evaluation Process. A fairly reliable figure can be estimated for purposes of budgeting. All that is needed is to choose the evaluation format form of faculty report-back and estimate visiting team costs. Costs for evaluation report forms can be obtained from the publishers (contact the NCA State Committee office). Style

of report-back will determine the Xerox and reproduction costs. If each sub-committee report is to be duplicated for each member of the evaluation group (faculty, representive students and parents, etc.) then ditto and paper costs can be calculated accordingly. Extra supplies can be calculated as needed.

The cost of the visiting team cannot be estimated quite so precisely. However, a fairly accurate estimate can be made by following these steps: 1) check with the NCA state chairman for an estimate of team size and an estimate of average distance each team member is likely to travel; compute mileage cost at the current approved rate; 2) check with the motel of your choice for double occupancy rates and calculate room costs based on estimated number of out-of-town visitors; 3) calculate food costs according to the number of meal times the team will be on campus and according to the number of team meals furnished on campus; and 4) estimate pencil, paper and other workroom supply costs for the visiting team.

Needs of the Visiting Team. The self-evaluation is the main event but in order for the visiting team to assist in their role as validators and advisors careful preparation needs to be made: 1) mail-out packets should be received by visiting team members at least 10 days prior to the visit. They should include cover letter, directions to school, school parking and motel, a complete schedule of the evaluation period, the school philosophy, the School/Community Report, a copy of each subject or major section report on which committee that visitor is to serve; 2) motel arrangements, normally double occupancy; 3) some allocated place of convenient parking for team members; 4) a workroom for the team with chair and table space for each team member. Workroom supplies should include refreshments, paper, pencils, and should be provided with a chalkboard; 5) professional staff personal reports and transcripts should be on file in the workroom; 6) a work packet for each team member should include a school map, class schedule, faculty list, faculty policy handbook, student handbook and any other items of interest to the team members; and 7) other items in the workroom might include copies of the school paper, school yearbook and other items such as board policy booklets.

This section was intended only to assist in reminding principals and/or steering committees of some of the more important logistical aspects of evaluation. Other items will make themselves known in specific situations.

The Visiting Team Departs and the Report Comes Back

The preparation and the visit are now past. The visitors have made their recommendations in a bound report. There are just two notions that should be mentioned here. One is the notion of classification and prioritization of recommendations. The other is what to do about implementation and responding to the mandatory first and third year reports to the state committee.

Relative to the first point, if there is a reason for classification and prioritization, it is probably that when the faculty first looks at the finished report, the number of recommendations seems overwhelming. A typical report probably contains no less than one hundred and, occasionally, as high as three hundred recommendations. This constitutes a formidable array, and one of the most difficult tasks is determining where to begin. Essentially, the need to make order out of chaos may best be accomplished by simply classifying and prioritizing. By the first of these terms is meant the simple act of dividing the recommendations into time and feasibility categories. Some recommendations are the kind that can be implemented simply by the appropriate teacher or teachers doing it, without cost or preliminary fanfare. Others need the coordinated planning of a whole department or more. Others need the executive level action that only an administrator can provide. Still others need financial backing or policy change that only the board can provide. Prioritywise, there are probably only three categories: urgent, desirable and inappropriate. It may be helpful to make a two-dimensional grid with classification on one scale and priorities on the other, as pictured here. Each recommendation should be judged as to which cell it falls into. The inappropriate recommendations can be discarded immediately and the rest can be handled in good order according to their labels of priority and implementation difficulty.

		ACTION			
		Individual	Department	Admin.	Board
PRIORITY	Urgent				
	Desirable				
	Inappropriate				

Relative to the second point, the only problem is the view that some school persons hold toward the first and third year report. It is quite simple. The only purpose of this report is to monitor school action. The only way a school can go wrong is to do nothing at all. The school is not obligated to implement any of the recommendations. There is only a moral obligation to consider them. On any given recommendation, a considered decision that the recommendation is inappropriate is sufficient. It was not the intent of this ruling to force schools to implement all of the recommendations of an evaluation. It was the intent to encourage the schools to take them seriously, to consider them and to initiate whatever action seems appropriate. If a given faculty is confused, then the classification and priorities approach is probably a good way to begin.

Selected Bibliography

Armstrong, Robert L. **The Writing of School Philosophy,** Arizona State University Bureau of Educational Research and Services Bulletin No. 34

Boersma, Wendell Claire. "The Effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a Stimulus for School Improvement in Eleven Michigan High Schools." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967.

Clark, Leonard H., Raymond L. Klein, and John B. Burks. **The American Secondary School Curriculum.** New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.

Cope, Quill E. "An Appraisal of School Improvements Resulting from the Use of the Evaluative Criteria in Selected High Schools in Tennessee." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, New York University, 1952.

Ely, Lawrence. "Teachers' Reaction to School Evaluation Using the Evaluative Criteria," **National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,** Vol. 40, No. 219 (December, 1959), pp. 38-43. (The Association is hereafter referred to as NASSP.)

Evaluative Criteria. 1960 ed. Washington: National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 1960.

Haskew, Laurence D. "What Lies Ahead," **Cooperative Planning for Education in 1980.** Denver: Designing Education for the Future, An Eight-States Project, January, 1968.

Kemp, John Stephen. "Purposes and Procedures of Secondary School Evaluation." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967.

Morphet, Edgar, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. **Educational Administration.** Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. **Elementary School Evaluative Criteria.** Arlington, Va. 1972.

_____. **Evaluative Criteria,** 4th Edition, Washington, D.C. 1969.

_____. **Junior High School/Middle School Evaluative Criteria,** Arlington, Va. 1970.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. **Directives and Guidelines for the Improvement of Secondary School Evaluation.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Improving Your School Through Self-Evaluation.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Know Your North Central Association.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **N.C.A. Quarterly.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Policies, Principles, and Standards for the Approval of Junior High Schools.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Procedures for Evaluation of Junior High Schools.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. **Procedures for Evaluation of High Schools.** Boulder, Colorado.

_____. The **NCA Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools,** Boulder, Colorado.

Oliver, Albert I. **Curriculum Improvement.** New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., Inc., 1965.

Schwartz, Alfred, and Stuart C. Tiedeman. **Evaluating Student Progress in the Secondary Schools.** New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1957.

Shannon, Gail. "Planning for Evaluation in the Junior High School," **NASSP Bulletin,** Vol. 44, No. 253 (February, 1960), pp. 12-15.

Vredeval, L.E. "How May a Program of Self Evaluation of the School Be Organized and Administered?," **NASSP Bulletin,** Vol. 39, No. 210 (April, 1955), pp. 104-108.

Wiltse, N.G. "How May a Program of Self Evaluation Be Organized and Administered?," **NASSP Bulletin,** Vol. 39, No. 210 (April, 1955), pp. 102-104.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne, Joseph Justman, and Irving Robbins. **Evaluation in Modern Education.** New York: American Book Co., 1956.

Publications

The Bureau of Educational Research and Services

Educational Services Bulletins

22. **First Year Principal's Conference Proceedings,** Merwin Deever, February, 1967 ..... $1.00

23. **Proceedings of the 6th Annual Invitational Reading Conference,** Laurel B. Boetto, October, 1967 ..... $1.00

25. **First Year Principal's Conference Proceedings,** Harold B. Hunnicutt, January, 1969 ..... $1.00

26. **Proceedings of the 7th Annual Invitational Reading Conference,** Laurel B. Boetto, June, 1969 ..... $2.00

27. **Staff Personnel Conference Proceedings, 1969,** Harold E. Moore, May, 1969 ..... $1.00

29. **Supplementary Materials for the Teaching of Reading,** Jann Skinner and Phoebe Slaughter, 1969 ..... $2.00

30. **Proceedings: Second Annual Junior College Conference,** Donald Bridgman, July 1969 ..... $1.00

31. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1970,** Harold E. Moore, January, 1970 ..... $1.00

32. **Philosophic Contributions to Socio-Psychotherapy,** Frederic Mitchell, Robert Rein'l, James Skelton, 1970 ..... $2.00

33. **Proceedings: 9th Annual Education Round-Up, 1970,** Raymond Wochner and James Carpenter, April, 1970 ..... $1.00

35. **Proceedings: 10th and 11th Indian Education Conference, 1969/1970,** Center for Indian Education, February, 1971 ..... $2.00

36. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1971,** Harold E. Moore, January, 1971 ..... $1.00

37. **Attitudes of Arizona Educators Toward Sex Education,** Nelson Haggerson and Naomi Cohen, April, 1971 ..... $2.00

38. **A Selected Bibliography of Print and Non-Print Media in the Audio-Visual Field,** Pamelia Eck and Marcella Bethancourt, May, 1971 ..... $1.50

40. **Recommendation From a Data Base for Comprehensive Change at Phoenix Union High School,** Joe Eddie Lopez, Robert Grinder and Michael Clark, May, 1971 ..... $2.00

41. **Proceedings: The 3rd Annual Junior College Conference,** Quentin Bogart, July, 1971 ..... $1.00

42. **A Taxonomy of Subject Matter Presentation,**
James E. Fresier, December, 1971 ..... $2.00

43. **At the Crossroads: The American School Administrator,**
William G. Walker, February, 1972 ..... $1.50

44. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1972,**
Harold E. Moore, January, 1972 ..... $2.00

45. **Developmental Counseling,**
H. D. Richardson, May, 1972 ..... $2.50

46. **Proceedings: 4th Community College Conference,**
May, 1972 ..... $1.00

47. **Proceedings: The 5th Community College Conference,**
February 8-9, 1973; May, 1973 ..... $1.00

47a. **Proceedings: 13th and 14th Indian Education Conferences,**
1972/1973 ..... $2.00

49. **Proceedings: 15th Indian Education Conference,**
1974 ..... $2.00

51. **Competency-Based Administrator Preparation,**
November 21-22, 1974 ..... $2.50

52. **Competency-Based Preparation of Educational Administrators,**
February 2-3, 1976 ..... $5.00

53. **Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations: A Look at What's Happening from the National Perspective,**
S.J. Knezevich, June, 1976 ..... $1.50